



MINUTES OF THE FOURTH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING OF PAN-SPSO PROJECT PHASE 2 HELD ON 6TH FEBRUARY 2014 IN NAIROBI, KENYA

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Madam Rhoda Peace Tumussiime	Commissioner for Rural Economy and Agriculture, AUC
Dr Abebe Haile Gabriel	Director DREA – AUC
Dr. Ahmed El-Sawalhy	Director AU-IBAR,
Dr Jean Gérard Mezui M’Ella	AU-IAPSC
Mr. Hulmann Beedeeman	SADC
Dr William Olaho-Mukani	EAC
Dr Baschirou Demsa	CEEAC/ECCAS
Dr Samuel Wakhusama	IGAD
Dr Yoseph Mamo	COMESA

MEMBER ABSENT:

ECOWAS
UMA
CEN-SAD

OBSERVERS PRESENT:

Dr Jean Kamanzi	FAO
Dr Patrick Bastiaensen	OIE

SECRETARIAT

Dr. Raphael Coly	AU-IBAR, PAN-SPSO Coordinator
Mrs. Grace Akao	AU-IAPSC, Plant Health Officer, PANSPSO
Mr. Daniel Alifaki	Head of Finance and Administration
Mrs. Catherine Oduor	AU-IBAR Senior Finance Officer
Mr. Andrew Edewa	Food safety Officer, PANSPSO
Ms. Susan Mugwe	M&E Officer, AU-IBAR
Dr Bruce Mukanda	Head of Programmes & Projects Unit
Ms. Grace Uwamwezi	Admin. Assistant

AGENDA FOR THE MEETING

	Agenda point (subject)	Discussions required (+reparation)	Envisaged outcome (i.e Decision, information sharing etc.)
1	Adoption of agenda	Propose for comment and approval	Adoption of agenda with items modified and/ or added accordingly
2	• Matters arising from the minutes and	• Review progress	• Comments

	status of implementation of recommendations of the previous steering committee		
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of the PAN-SPSO technical and financial annual reports 2013 • Presentation of the report and the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation of PANSPSO Consolidation phase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review progress report and adoption • Review progress and comment • Propose for comment and approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments and adoption • Comments • Comments and adoption
4	Any other business Conclusion and Recommendations		Information shared Guidance provided Appropriate remedial action taken

Agenda point	Discussion/Decisions	Tasks	Responsible	By when
1. Opening Ceremony - Adoption of the agenda	<p>The opening ceremony was as follow: Welcome Remarks by Director Prof. Ahmed El-Sawalhy. The Director of AU-IBAR, being the main host, welcomed all participants of the fourth Steering Committee of PANSPSO project to Nairobi and to AU-IBAR in particular. He informed the PSC that PANSPSO was only one of several projects implemented by AU-IBAR and partners.</p> <p>2. Remarks by Mr. Pietro Nardi, EU Representative of the EU Delegation</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A

	<p>to Kenya</p> <p>The representative of the EU Delegation in Nairobi informed the PSC that the EU has been supporting and will continue to support AU. He cited a number of projects currently being supported by the EU, including the VETGOV, PANSPSO, and Fisheries Governance. As for PANSPSO he reported that a Global amount of 500,000 EURO has been approved for the final project period. This being a consolidation phase, there was need to draw lessons on what contribution it has made and to develop a proper exit strategy. He added that it was necessary to review critically the results of the MTE and have a clear way forward.</p> <p>3. Opening Speech by Commissioner REA, H.E. Madam Rhoda Peace Tumusiime</p> <p>The Commissioner of AU-DREA, gave the opening speech at the Steering Committee meeting. She said the Steering Committee meeting was scheduled to take place in November 2013 in Gaborone, Botswana back to back with the Steering Committee meeting of VET-GOV. However, due to the timing of the mid-term evaluation of the project, it was necessary to postpone the meeting in order to accommodate the findings of the mid-term evaluation. She observed that the Steering committee is in place to provide strategic guidance to the project and complimented IBAR for ensuring that PANSPSO builds synergies and complementarities with other projects. It was She noted that although the project is on course, the Continent continues to face diverse SPS related challenges such as animal health risks, and gave an example of chicken meat caused by imports from Latin American countries as well as challenges in grain movement. In this regard, stakeholders in the SPS were called upon to go beyond the project boundaries in relation with global communities vis a vis agricultural products coming into the continent. She acknowledged that there may be important matters arising from the evaluation of the project and encouraged the Steering Committee</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>to develop clear strategies for successful delivery of project inputs. In conclusion, the Commissioner informed the meeting that DREA, as a whole, will continue to support, promote and sustain, with the involvement of RECs and specifically the Member States, the effective participation of African countries in the sanitary and phytosanitary standard setting processes and most importantly, to comply with the standards.</p> <p>The agenda of the meeting was adopted without any change.</p> <p>The quorum for the meeting is 8 members present out of the 11. Therefore the meeting can deliberate.</p>			
<p>2. • Matters arising from the minutes and status of implementation of recommendations of the previous steering committee</p>	<p>The minutes of the previous steering committee was reviewed by the Project coordinator and the progress made in the achievement of the decisions and recommendations was presented as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The implementation of the previous meeting of the SC on the participation of the private sector in the meeting of the steering committee, and requests IBAR to prepare a concept note on the participation of the private sector to the steering committee or other governance organ, and report to the next steering committee. 	<p>Status of implementation</p> <p>Not implemented as the approved TORs did not mention their participation.</p>	<p>Guidance</p> <p>TORs be amended to include private sector. The short period remaining to project closure should be borne in mind.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementation of the recommendation of the first steering committee of phase 2, on sensitization of decision makers on the need to invest in SPS matters and support SPS institutions at national and regional level, including SPS committees. 	Implemented		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PANSPSO coordination to improve communication on ongoing activities with RECs focal points, to improve the implication and involvement of RECs in the project activities 	Implemented		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PANSPSO coordination to improve communication of documents prior to the SC meetings 	Implemented		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PANSPSO coordination to present the progress made in implementation of recommendation of the previous SC in form of a matrix showing the status of implementation and challenges met in implementation if any. 	Implemented		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUC to secure core resources to support the implementation of common positions activities, and ensure the sustainability and independence of the process 	In progress. Resources included in AU-IBAR 2014-2017 SP; the continental program and the livestock strategy, and in Program budget 2015.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AUC to organize a meeting between AU-IBAR and AU-IAPSC to improve collaboration between the two offices for the implementation of the project 	Will be done by DREA in the margin of the PSC		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AU-IBAR and AU-IAPSC to improve their joint planning and reporting as well as communication and exchange of information • RECs should support further the national SPS committees that have been initiated in their Member countries • IAPSC to document the success story of building common position in the CPM meetings • AU-IBAR in partnership with WTO SPS committee to organize training for African delegates in WTO SPS committee • AU-IBAR to establish a mechanism for improving participation of Africa and formulating common position, like for instance meeting of African delegates in Geneva, prior to WTO SPS committees sessions, with the assistance of AU Office in Geneva. • Cover page should contains the logo of the 8 RECs. Extension to all working documents 	<p>In progress</p> <p>In progress</p> <p>Implemented</p> <p>Implemented</p> <p>In progress</p> <p>Implemented</p>		
2.b. Presentation of the annual report of the second year	<p>Presentation of the annual report of the second year</p> <p>Comments/reactions arising from the presentation</p> <p>Sensitization of Ministers of Animal Resources, and Panafrican Parliamentarians (PAP) on SPS issues: This was re-emphasized calling for continued sensitization of decision makers to solicit prioritization of investment in SPS matters and support SPS institutions at national level.</p>			

	<p>Director IAPSC called for an all-inclusive advocacy including agriculture, however, it was noted that this is taken care of in regard to the structure of Ministries in MS.</p> <p>OIE representative questioned about the consultant who developed the OIE handbook. It was Dr. Gideon Bruckner.</p> <p>Director- DREA: why was the 2nd tranche of support funds cut down to 50% and how is this going to impact on project implementation? What arrangements are in place to mitigate such drastic reduction in the budget?</p> <p>The EU-Representative explained that PANSPSO is a very important project and is funded through DG-Trade. Funding decisions cannot be influenced by EU country offices. Since there was no proper written agreement, it is necessary to view positively that DG-Trade has extended additional 500,000 EURO to PANSPSO. It should be seen as a fund that integrates other funding to AU. The EU remains committed to funding obligations to AU.</p> <p>The Coordinator further explained that there is need for readjustment of the work plan to mitigate against the effect on implementation of planned activities.</p> <p>ECCAS stated that it has very limited funding from the project and not sufficient to implement meaningful activities. As countries are at different level of SPS levels of SPS controls and it is challenging when resources are limited for setting controls. Same applies to RECs, the reason why they do not participate in ISSOs and WTO SPS Committee meetings. There is need to prioritize intervention areas, and there is need for more capacity building of RECs and MS particularly for policy and decision</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>makers and make SPS a priority in MS.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The Coordinator explained that ECCAS has received same amount of money as other RECs, but generally there is need to increase support across the continent. In general there is need for MS to allocate budgets toward SPS matters.</p> <p>COMESA stated that PANSPSO has provided a building block to standard setting in RECs and MS. There is need to encourage RECs and MS to invest in SPS capacity building and setting rather than depending on external support. This is a matter that was echoed by the Commissioner- DREA who also emphasized on sustainable intervention mechanisms.</p> <p>Director of AU-IAPSC, about the study on movement of Cassava germplasm, there is need to promote regional norms/standards that will help countries in the different RECs. Although recruitment of consultant did not happen, there is need to move forward quickly to address pertinent SPS challenges in the continent, in particular for plant health. For the coordinator, it will be useful if RECs can disseminate the information across their countries to get more applications.</p> <p>Commissioner-DREA:</p> <p>On production of handbooks and publications based on scientific journals, there appears to be high performance on IBAR than IAPSC- need to clarify.</p> <p>Position papers- why one rather than many? As countries continue to meet, there will gradually be commonality in issues, something that the PANSPSO has contributed.</p> <p>Coordinator: The process has been slow from the plant health area, but a</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>quotation is now available.</p> <p>The purpose is to consolidate support on issues of common interest to African countries and strategize on how to present these in international meetings.</p> <p>IAPSC- The challenge for Africa is that AU cannot speak for MS like is the case with the EU. The common positions help a lot in this regard because AU is only an observer organization.</p> <p>FAO:</p> <p>SPS standard setting processes should be based on risk, and countries requiring standards must carry out risk assessment. PANSPSO has helped countries to participate in international standard setting which uses data from different countries globally. There is still need to develop capacity in risk assessment to provide scientific data needed for standard setting from Africa perspective.</p> <p>Director-DREA</p> <p>Are there attempts to bring all African countries together in Codex and OIE regional groupings?</p> <p>Coordinator: the project does not segregate African MS which are the direct beneficiaries. While CODEX and IPPC have regional groupings that do follow the grouping of African Union member states, the project makes sure all AU MS are represented and benefit from the activities implemented.</p> <p>The financial report covering the period from 1st January to 31st December 2013 was presented by AU-IBAR Senior Finance Officer.</p> <p>The global disbursement rate at end of 2013 is 64% with regard to the overall budget of the project and is 85% with regard to the funds received</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>in the account.</p> <p>It was explained that RECs did not open a bank account to receive the funds of the project to avoid administrative burdens to manage small amounts. could not absorb allocations because of low amounts</p> <p>A comment was made that Staff Costs already at 76.62%, but should be at least 66.7%</p> <p>OIE asked if the 500,000 Euro been reflected in the report?</p> <p>COMESA commented that the budget and expenses should have been per result Area.</p> <p>The Senior Finance Officer explained that: Staff increments were made during the year and pushed staff budget line expenditure. The amount of 500,000 Euro is part of the report. Result Area breakdown is available and could be provided if necessary</p> <p>AU-IAPSC: There is no clarity for expenses between IBAR and Partners as it is with RECs. The report needs to breakdown further the different allocations under IBAR.</p> <p>The explanation is that there are some overlapping Result Areas between RECs and AU-IBAR. That is reason for difficulty in providing separate breakdown for RECs There are some activities in Food safety component, while animal health</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>component has been taken up by VETGOV.</p> <p>AU-IAPSC raised concern on financial reporting. It is necessary that the expenses be broken down per component.</p> <p>AU-IBAR clarified that animal health activities were covered under VETGOV project and that the SAP reporting system guided the financial inputting.</p> <p>FAO wanted clarity on why an additional 1 million Euro was requested (although only 500,000 received),</p> <p>.</p> <p>AU-IBAR explained that the initial agreement was 2 million for 2 years, but an additional 1 million was promised for the 3rd year.</p> <p>EU- Rep clarified that a number of factors were considered with additional 500,000 EURO disbursement.</p> <p>This calls for amendments in work plans and administrative procedures to avoid problems experienced last year.</p>			
<p>2.c. • Presentation of the report and the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation of PANSPSO Consolidation phase</p>	<p>Presentation by Dr. Chris Daborn, Consultant for PANSPSO MTE</p> <p>The project has been too centralized and needs to decentralize by sharing roles with partners e.g. CABI, KEPHIS</p> <p>RECs generally passive participants</p> <p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of effective participation by RECs in the implementation 2. The need to review the arrangements for enabling AU-IAPSC to function as co-implementer of PANSPSO 3. The value for money of the reliance on meetings and workshops 			

	<p>in the implementation of PANSPSO- II and the proposal to pilot an interactive e-management, knowledge and learning platform as complimentary approach</p> <p>4. Application to the EU Delegation for a one year no cost extension (NCE) to December 2015.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adopt revised log-frame for IBAR-IAPSC 2. Strengthen functioning of national and regional SPS Committees 3. Support human resources (HR) SPS capacity at RECs to coordinate and harmonize MS SPS capacity 4. Enhance the skills and knowledge of all personnel involved in managing and delivering SPS services. 5. Improve coordination and information sharing between PAN-SPSO II, OIE, CODEX, IPPC/PH and WTO contact persons and public and private sector representatives 6. Trial, in selected countries, the adoption of improved SPS curricula and the development and delivery of continuing education/professional development 7. No cost extension of the project. <p>General recommendation: explore new ways of thinking into the future.</p> <p>Reactions to the presentation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of effective participation by RECs in the implementation <p>OIE</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>The ISSOs have also been contacted and OIE in particular are happy with the PANSPSO results. There are tremendous improvements in the participation and comments raised during global meetings. There is need to institutionalize the gains made during the project.</p> <p>There seems to be a problem of ownership by RECs. Perhaps they need to develop trade promotion projects that address SPS matters, such as the case that COMESA is doing. Need to focus on addressing specific SPS related NTBs in the continent. Need to have a PANSPSO project in each REC. With regard to e-learning, OIE is investigating this new area and will be happy to partner with AU-IBAR in its development.</p> <p>FAO FAO is happy with results of the PANSPSO and commends EU for supporting the project. African countries have actively participated actively in Codex and IPPC activities. A lot of work needs to be continued, including the strengthening of national SPS committees, and the exit strategy is the way forward. The next phase should focus on strategic ways of ensuring SPS issues are mainstreamed into CAADP. Key areas of intervention should be identified. On the food safety side, there is need to involve private sector more and more for sustainability purpose. E-learning is a good proposal but FAO already has an e-learning platform, so no need to re-invent the wheel.</p> <p>EAC SPS issues are central to EAC because of the new food security strategy and the common market. SPS protocol having been signed and awaiting ratification, EAC will continue finding ways of addressing SPS relates</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>constraints in the region.</p> <p>COMESA: In view of the emerging & re-emerging diseases and other SPS risks, RECS should immediately come up with strategies that address these concerns. There remains need to cooperation between RECs and AU-IBAR/IAPSC. There has to be a mechanism to continue the gains made.</p> <p>IGAD The relation between RECs and AU-IBAR, visits should be made to RECs by IBAR before calling a joint meeting of RECs</p> <p>ECCAS: There is a big challenge of heterogeneity in MS and so the interventions with new funding should be properly rationalized. There is a great need to ensure that the RECs have identified and institutionalized SPS issues in RECs.</p> <p>2. The need to review the arrangements for enabling AU-IAPSC to function as co-implementer of PANSPSO</p> <p>IAPSC: There is need to review the implementation framework between IBAR and IAPSC to ensure plant health activities are factored in accordingly. This meeting should be organized by AUC.</p> <p>3. The value for money of the reliance on meetings and workshops in the implementation of PANSPSO-II and the proposal to pilot an interactive e-management, knowledge and learning platform as</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>complimentary approach</p> <p>IAPSC: Internet is not very strong in some countries in the continent, and so E-Platforms are a tool for the future and not immediate.</p> <p>EAC: The E-platform suggestion is good but should be viewed as a future rather than immediate approach.</p> <p>COMESA: While e-platforms are good, there remains a great need for physical meetings to articulate issues and promote policy dialogue</p> <p>IBAR:</p> <p>The nature of ISSO activities demands for physical meetings. It is also necessary. Technology issues are also still low. E-platforms will make sense in a gradual approach</p> <p>E-platforms are being explored already and are a welcome recommendation although too early. There is a need to explore mechanisms that will help integrate producers and private sector in export value chains. We need risk based approaches that will support compliance along the chain.</p> <p>What is the extent of achievement realized so far Assessment of each result area necessary. Are there any unintended negative outcomes</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Profits drive private sector, we need to help them realize the benefits.</p> <p>E-platforms useful in information exchange with MS and could complement areas currently not within the project mandate but provide input into the standards setting process as a whole</p> <p>The Consultant should consider revising the presentation of the report as it currently portrays very inefficient use of resources. There is need for RECs to focus on building agro food chains to facilitate trade in the RECs. This also calls for relevant institutions playing their part.</p> <p>AU-IBAR Director: IBAR can backstop RECs on SPS issues Value for money- there is need to define clearly what this means considering that the results anticipated</p> <p>Director- DREA- Dr. Abebe The consultant should define more what value for money is all about. Was any expenditure outside the original design? Did the Consultant's passion influence for e-platforms influence the report?.</p> <p>Responses from the Consultant:</p> <p>The report is still interim and open to improvements. Inputs from Steering committee will be included. E-platforms are increasingly taking centre stage and there is need to adopt their use. Separation of activities between IBAR and IAPSC and a log frame is necessary.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>EU- Agreed that e-platform will not replace decision-making process which needs physical meeting. He clarified that no cost extension is not tied to e-platforms. Also, EU representative will confirm later whether there are any conditions to the additional 500,000 EURO from DG Trade like the dedication to animal health and food safety only.</p> <p>4. Application to the EU Delegation for a one year NCE to December 2015.</p> <p>SADC: No cost extension makes sense but a different approach is needed.</p> <p>EAC: EAC supports a no cost extension to further consolidate the gains made. COMESA: support for a NCE</p> <p>EU: A no cost extension is possible, but should be done in a different way/approach that is more efficient. EU remains committed to support the implementation of SPS issues and will support a no cost extension.</p> <p>FAO: FAO supported a no cost extension.</p>			
Conclusions and recommendations	The PAN-SPSO Steering Committee:			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approves the technical annual report • Approves the financial annual report <p>Pending clarification on the additional funding by EU, a work plan was not presented for approval by the PSC. This will be done later.</p> <p>The PAN-SPSO steering committee recommends:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AUC to find means to sustain the effective participation of MS in the meetings of international standard setting organizations (ISSOs) and of WTO SPS Committee. 2. AU-IBAR, AU-IAPSC and RECs to provide all support to the implementation of the exit strategy at national, regional and continental levels 3. AU-IBAR to segregate expenses that support phytosanitary activities for more visibility 4. AU-IBAR to request to EU a no cost extension based on the availability of funds 5. AU-IBAR and AU-IAPSC to convene a meeting with RECs to find ways for improving the working relationship with regard to PANSPSO Project in particular and to all AUC projects in general 			
--	---	--	--	--

	6. AUC to develop a rapid alert and information exchange system for SPS-related risks across MS and transparency obligations. 7. AU-IBAR to review the work plan and the budget for 2014 in light of the revised funding level. 8. AU-IBAR and AU-IAPSC to provide verifiable deliverables of the participation of MS in IPPC and Codex meetings 9. AU-IBAR to pilot and integrate E-platform into ARIS platform in the view to complement physical meetings 10. AUC, RECs and MS to strengthen SPS Committees by anchoring them into the CAADP Compacts and involve the private sector.			
End of the SC meeting	The meeting ended at 6:15 pm			
VENUE OF NEXT MEETING	TBD			

2014

Minutes of the fourth Steering Committee Meeting of Pan-SPSO project phase 2 Held on 6th February 2014 in Nairobi, Kenya

AU-IAPSC

AU-IAPSC

<http://archives.au.int/handle/123456789/1861>

Downloaded from African Union Common Repository